

**IN THE SPECIFICATION**

Please replace the indicated paragraph with the attached amended paragraph.

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, dated April 27, 2004, the Examiner states that Claims 1-25 are pending, Claims 1-4 and 14-16 are rejected, and Claims 5-13 and 17-25 are withdrawn. By the present Amendment, Applicant the claims.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 3,782,495 (Nassof). Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nassof in view of US 4,756,951 (Wang). Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nassof in view of US 3,619,344 (Wolinski). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nassof in view of Wang and Wolinski. The Applicant considers that the amendments to the claims overcome these rejections.

The Applicant has amended the claims to clarify that each sheet is printed while the sheet is in a tensioned state to thus overcome the problem of distortion on the printed pattern when the material is subsequently heated and fitted on a frame and then placed under tension by the cooling of the material. This is especially critical to large sheets used for false ceilings and walls, and not such a problem for smaller individual tiles.

None of the cited references disclose this pretensioned printed material. In particular, Nassof discloses the use of a thin plastic sheet material on a frame. However, there is no disclosure of using a pre-printed, pretensioned material to overcome the problem of print distortion. Print distortion is not a problem for the smaller tiles to which Nassof is directed to. Thus, the Applicant considers the rejections overcome.

The Applicant has also added new claims directed to a material on which each sheet is printed with a predeformed design that takes into account the

3

deformation that will occur when the sheets are tensioned. Likewise, none of the cited references disclose such a material.

The Applicant will be submitting an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) separate from and subsequent to the filing of this amendment to submit those references recited within the application.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

August 27, 2004

Date



Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613